

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 22 has been amended to depend from claim 20, thereby providing antecedent basis for the limitation “the mechanical clamp” in claim 22. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakamaki et al (US 6842278). In regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Sakamaki et al ('278) teach a method of applying patterned materials for manufacture of a flat panel light source, comprising: a) providing a flexible continuous substrate (50a; figure 24; column 19 line 65 to column 20 line 37) b) providing one or more application stations (see figure 24), each application station having: I) one or more stationary sources of material (118), ii) a supply of discrete patterned masks for defining a pattern of material to be applied to the substrate (116), iii) means for attaching the discrete patterned masks to the substrate (column 20 lines 4-10); iv) means for transporting the substrate and the patterned mask in registration past the one or more stationary sources of material (52; column 11 lines 7-25), and v) means for delivering the masks one at a time to the transporting means see figure 24); and c) transporting the substrate and the masks past the one or more application stations (52; see figure 24). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sakamaki et al does not appear to relate to manufacture of a flat panel light source. Rather the cited disclosure appears to relate to the manufacture of display medium in the form of electronic paper comprising black and white (or other colorant) particles on substrates. Further, there is no disclosure in Sakamaki of use of a supply of discrete patterned masks (plural), nor of means for delivering the masks one at a time to transporting means or means for attaching the discrete patterned masks to the substrate in the cited Fig. 24 embodiment. Further regarding claim 6,

materials 103 deposited in Sakamaki et al are clearly identified as colorant particles, not light emissive materials, semiconductor materials, conductors, or dielectrics as alleged by the Examiner, and regarding claim 10, there is no teaching in the Abstract relating to creating a flat panel light source as also alleged. Thus, Sakamaki et al clearly does not anticipate the present invention, and reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 3-5 and 12-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamaki et al (US 6842278) in view of Grace et al (US 20020196401). The Examiner states that Sakamaki et al ('278) disclose all the limitations set forth, except that the stationary sources are arranged in parallel with respect to the direction of transport; the application stations are arranged in parallel with respect to the direction of transport; the light source is an OLED light source; the substrate is a web mounted on a supply roller located on one side of the application station(s); and the step of cutting the substrate into sheets after deposition of the material, and that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of manufacturing a light display as taught by Sakamaki et al with the stationary sources, the light sources, and the web mounted substrate as taught by Grace et al ('401). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sakamaki et al does not teach a method of manufacturing a flat panel light source. Further, Grace et al ('401) does not appear to teach stationary sources arranged in parallel with respect to the direction of transport as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, cited figure 7 illustrates a single material application source (sprayer 182). Further, cited paragraphs 84 and 100 do not describe use of application stations having a supply of discrete patterned masks and the further requirements of the present claimed invention, and accordingly Grace et al does not overcome the deficiencies of the primary Sakamaki et al reference with respect to the present claimed invention. Hence, no reasonable combination of Sakamaki et al and Grace et al would appear to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present claimed invention. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9, 15, 16, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamaki et al (US 6842278) in view of Baude et al (US 2003015384). In regard to claims 8, 9, 15, and 20-23, the Examiner states that Sakamaki et al ('278) disclose all the limitations set forth, except the mask is a flexible sheet; the steps of cleaning material from the masks and reusing the masks; the step of shifting the mask relative to the substrate in a direction perpendicular to the direction of transport between sources; the means for attaching the mask to the substrate is a mechanical clamp that includes means for maintaining the substrate in a planar configuration; the clamp includes a rectangular frame having clamps on two opposing edges, and that it would have been obvious at the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of manufacturing a light display as taught by Sakamaki et al with the mask of Baude et al. In regard to claims 16, 18, and 19, the Examiner states that Sakamaki et al ('278) disclose all the limitations set forth, except the mask is made of a magnetic material and the means for attaching the mask to the substrate is a magnet located on an opposite side of the substrate from the mask; the magnet is a fixed magnet; and the magnet is conveyed along with the substrate, and that it would have been obvious at the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of manufacturing a light display as taught by Sakamaki et al with the mask of Baude et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sakamaki et al does not teach a method of manufacturing a flat panel light source. Further, Baude et al do not appear to describe use of application stations having a supply of discrete patterned masks and the further requirements of the present claimed invention, and accordingly Baude et al does not overcome the deficiencies of the primary Sakamaki et al reference with respect to the present claimed invention. Hence, no reasonable combination of Sakamaki et al and Baude et al would appear to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present claimed invention. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamaki et al (US 6842278) in view of D'Amato (US 6440277). The Examiner states that Sakamaki et al ('278) disclose all the limitations set forth, but is silent regarding the limitation that the mask is a rigid sheet, and that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of producing a light device as taught by Sakamaki et al with the mask of D'Amato. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sakamaki et al does not teach a method of manufacturing a flat panel light source. Further, D'Amato et al do not appear to describe use of application stations having a supply of discrete patterned masks and the further requirements of the present claimed invention, and accordingly D'Amato et al does not overcome the deficiencies of the primary Sakamaki et al reference with respect to the present claimed invention. Hence, no reasonable combination of Sakamaki et al and D'Amato et al would appear to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present claimed invention. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.


Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamaki et al (US 6842278) in view of Baude et al (US 200315384) and further in view of D'Amato (US 6440277). The Examiner states that Sakamaki/Baude disclose all the limitations set forth, but is silent regarding the limitation that the means for attaching the mask includes a reference surface for locating the substrate with respect to the source of material, and that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of producing a light device as taught by Sakamaki/Baude with the mask of D'Amato. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Sakamaki et al does not teach a method of manufacturing a flat panel light source. Further, neither Baude et al or D'Amato et al appear to describe use of application stations having a supply of discrete patterned masks and the further requirements of the present claimed invention, and accordingly Baude et al and D'Amato et al do not overcome the deficiencies of the primary Sakamaki et al reference with respect to the present claimed invention. Hence, no reasonable combination of

Sakamaki et al, Baude et al and D'Amato et al would appear to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present claimed invention. Reconsideration of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-9662
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.